

1 MICHAEL E. GATES, City Attorney (SBN 258446)
2 NADIN S. SAID, Senior Deputy City Attorney (SBN 309802)
3 Office of the City Attorney
4 2000 Main Street, P.O. Box 190
5 Huntington Beach, CA 92648
6 (714) 536-5555
7 Email: Michael.Gates@surfcity-hb.org
8 Email: Nadin.Said@surfcity-hb.org

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, HUNTINGTON
11 BEACH CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR TONY STRICKLAND
12 and MAYOR PRO TEM GRACEY VAN DER MARK

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, a
16 California Charter City, and Municipal
17 Corporation, the HUNTINGTON
18 BEACH CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR OF
19 HUNTINGTON BEACH, TONY
20 STRICKLAND, and MAYOR PRO TEM
21 OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, GRACEY
22 VAN DER MARK

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 GAVIN NEWSOM, in his official
26 capacity as Governor of the State of
27 California, and individually; GUSTAVO
28 VELASQUEZ in his official capacity as
Director of the State of California
Department of Housing and Community
Development, and individually; STATE
LEGISLATURE; STATE OF
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT; SOUTHERN

CASE NO. 8:23-CV-00421-FWD-ADSx

**AMENDED JOINT RULE 26(f)
REPORT**

Date: June 29, 2023

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 10D

1 CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
 2 GOVERNMENTS; and DOES 1-50,
 3 inclusive,
 Defendants.

4 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), CACD LR-26-1, and the
 5 Order Setting Rule 26(f) Scheduling Conference (Dkt. No. 47), Plaintiffs City of
 6 Huntington Beach *et al.* (“Plaintiffs”), Defendants Gavin Newsom, Gustavo
 7 Velasquez, and the State of California Department of Housing and Community
 8 Development (the “State Defendants”), and Defendant Southern California
 9 Association of Governments (“SCAG”) (Plaintiffs, the State Defendants, and
 10 SCAG, collectively, the “Parties”) submit this Joint Rule 26(f) Report for the
 11 Court’s consideration for the Rule 26(f) Scheduling Conference set for June 22,
 12 2023.

13 **A. Statement of the Case**

14 **Plaintiffs’ Statement:**

15 Plaintiffs’ lawsuit arises from violations of the U.S. Constitution, the
 16 California Constitution, and State Statutes whereby the Governor, the Director,
 17 HCD, SCAG, and other Defendants have unconstitutionally commandeered the
 18 autonomy and Charter City authority of the City of Huntington Beach (“City”)
 19 and are forcing the City Council to adopt findings contrary to the evidence and
 20 City Council direction in direct violation of the First Amendment of the U.S.
 21 Constitution.

22 According to the Governor and Director of HCD, State Housing and RHNA
 23 Laws require the City Council to vote in a very certain, State-mandated, pre-
 24 ordained way, to adopt a Housing Element with a State-mandate of 13,368 units of
 25 high-density RHNA units. In doing so, the Governor and Director of HCD are
 26 ordering the City Council to make certain findings, contrary to the evidence in
 27 violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Governor and
 28 Director of HCD are requiring that the City Council make *very certain, State-*

1 *mandated, pre-ordained* findings (speech) that the creation of 13,368 RHNA units
 2 of high-density housing by redeveloping already-developed areas of the City
 3 outweighs the known substantial negative impacts to the City’s environment. In this
 4 case, the “Project” that triggers CEQA is the City’s required amendment to its
 5 Housing Element. As part of the CEQA process, it was determined that the Housing
 6 Element amendment necessitated an Environmental Impact Report which impart
 7 outlines and informs the public of the environmental impacts associated with the
 8 Project. In this case, because some of the substantial impacts cannot be mitigated,
 9 CEQA requires that the City Council adopt a “Statement of Overriding
 10 Considerations” (“SOC”) before the Project (Housing Element update) can move
 11 forward. The SOC must justify, as a matter of environmental impact, that the
 12 benefits of the Project (the massive State-mandated increase in high-density housing
 13 in the City) outweigh the negative environmental impacts. The City Council cannot
 14 make these findings and are being sued by the State as a result of having not made
 15 State compelled findings.

16 The RHNA Laws, which force cities to create high-density development,
 17 *compel* the City Council to arrive at a “fixed” conclusion in favor of high-density
 18 housing in the City regardless of the City Council’s consideration, through public
 19 hearings, of a SOC. Moreover, the State’s recent Housing and RHNA Laws
 20 impede on City’s independent legislative authority and claim to prevent judicial
 21 review¹ of the HCD administrative rulings, which violates constitutional
 22 principles of Separation of Powers and Procedural and Substantive Due Process
 23 afforded by the U.S. Constitution and the California Constitution.

24 Finally, in 2022, the State’s Independent Auditor determined that the
 25 State’s/HCD’s 2021 calculations created using flawed RHNA Laws, were
 26 erroneous, concluding in part: “HCD could not demonstrate that it adequately
 27

28 ¹ The State Legislature amended the RHNA process to *eliminate judicial review*
 when it amended Section 65584(c)(4) in 2004.

1 considered all of the factors that state law requires”²

2 In sum, the RHNA Laws are unconstitutionally vague and ambiguous (at
3 best) and create a flawed process that mandates that the City of Huntington Beach
4 zone for of 13,368 RHNA Units. The RHNA Laws violate the U.S. Constitution, the
5 California Constitution, and Federal and State law.

6 **State Defendants’ Statement:**

7 The disagreement between State Defendants and Plaintiffs involve purely
8 legal issues. The State Defendants contend that Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue
9 these claims as a matter of law. “A municipal corporation, created by a state for the
10 better ordering of government, has no privileges or immunities under the Federal
11 Constitution which it may invoke in opposition to the will of its creator.” *Williams v.*
12 *Mayor & City Council of Baltimore*, 289 U.S. 36, 40 (1933). Likewise, State
13 Defendants believe that this Court should invoke *Younger* abstention to avoid
14 interfering with an ongoing enforcement action against Plaintiff City of Huntington
15 Beach for violating state housing law. State Defendants further assert that the
16 Eleventh Amendment bars Plaintiffs from litigating state law claims in federal court.
17 That state law precludes Plaintiffs from challenging their regional housing needs
18 assessment also necessarily means that they have no fraud claim under state law.
19 Finally, even assuming Plaintiffs had enforceable federal constitutional rights
20 against the State Defendants (which they do not), State Defendants contend that the
21 state laws and actions to which Plaintiffs object do not violate those rights at all.

22 **SCAG’s Statement:**

23 This action concerns Plaintiffs’ meritless constitutional and state law
24 challenges to statewide legislation commonly known as the Regional Housing
25 Needs Allocation, codified at Government Code section 65585 et seq. (“RHNA
26

27 ² Online: California City News, “*Auditor Rips Housing Department Over Flawed*
28 *RHNA Process*,” April 2022, <https://www.californiacitynews.org/2022/04/state-auditor-rips-housing-department-over-flawed-rhna-process.html>

1 Laws”). The RHNA Laws were expressly adopted to require the accommodation of,
2 and ultimately foster development of, fair share housing throughout California.
3 Plaintiffs name as defendants both the State Defendants, which are charged with
4 setting the fair share number of housing units (known as the “regional
5 determination”) and administering enforcement of a timely and compliant housing
6 element, and SCAG, the government entity statutorily charged with allocating the
7 regional determination of housing units among SCAG’s 197 constituent
8 jurisdictions located throughout the counties of Ventura, Los Angeles, Riverside,
9 San Bernardino, Orange and Imperial. The RHNA Laws in question require all
10 cities and counties in California to review and update the housing elements
11 contained in their respective general plans during a periodic cycle in order to
12 accommodate and comply with the RHNA housing units they are assigned. In 2021,
13 the City of Huntington Beach was allocated RHNA Units pursuant to this process
14 and was required to update its housing element by late October 2021. Plaintiffs
15 failed to do so and instead brought suit two years later – which was the day after
16 Plaintiffs were sued by the California Attorney General in the Superior Court for
17 Orange County in connection with their failure to comply with the various
18 provisions of the RHNA Laws.

19 Plaintiffs’ claims challenging the RHNA Laws are legally deficient, including
20 on the basis that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case. As
21 explained in SCAG’s pending Motion to Dismiss, it is well-established that
22 Plaintiffs lack standing to challenge state statutes – such as the RHNA Laws at issue
23 here – because political subdivisions of a state are categorically precluded from
24 challenging state laws on federal constitutional grounds. And, even if Plaintiffs had
25 standing to bring federal constitutional claims – and to be clear, they do not –
26 Plaintiffs’ state and federal claims lack merit, as they do not come close to meeting
27 the requisite threshold to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6).

28 ///

1 In sum, Plaintiffs lack standing to bring their claims in federal court, and
 2 Plaintiffs nevertheless fail to state any colorable claims.

3 **B. Subject Matter Jurisdiction:**

4 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

5 28 U.S.C. 1331, as Plaintiffs allege Defendants have committed substantial
 6 deprivation of rights under the U.S. Constitution and Defendants have deprived
 7 Plaintiffs of First Amendment rights, Constitutional rights of Procedural and
 8 Substantive Due Process, and Defendants have violated the Commerce Clause of the
 9 U.S. Constitution. Accordingly, this Court has federal question jurisdiction under
 10 28 U.S.C. Sections 1331 and 1343. This Court has authority to award the requested
 11 Declaratory Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201; and the requested Injunctive Relief and
 12 damages under 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a).

13 **State Defendants' Position:**

14 State Defendants contend that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over
 15 this dispute because Plaintiffs, in their official capacity, have no federally protected
 16 constitutional rights that they may enforce against the State Defendants in federal
 17 court. Furthermore, the Eleventh Amendment bars this Court from considering
 18 Plaintiffs' state law claims.

19 **SCAG's Position:**

20 As thoroughly explained in SCAG's pending Motion to Dismiss, the Court
 21 does not possess federal subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case, as Plaintiffs
 22 lack standing to bring their federal challenges to the RHNA Laws. *City of South*
 23 *Lake Tahoe v. California Tahoe Reg'l Plan. Agency*, 625 F.2d 231, 233 (9th Cir.
 24 1980). This is because charter cities, as political subdivisions of the state, cannot
 25 assert violations of federal constitutional rights against the state, including another
 26 political subdivision such as SCAG. *Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Auth. v.*
 27 *City of Burbank*, 136 F.3d 1360, 1364 (9th Cir. 1998). Standing is a jurisdictional
 28 requirement that cannot be waived. *B.C. v. Plumas Unified Sch. Dist.*, 192 F.3d

1 1260, 1264 (9th Cir. 1999).

2 **C. Legal Issues:**

3 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

4 This case is about whether certain RHNA Laws, along with CEQA, and in
 5 addition to actions of the individual Defendants, Governor Newsom and HCD
 6 Director Gustavo Velasquez violate the U.S. Constitution, including the First
 7 and Fourteenth Amendments, Separation of Powers, Bill of Attainder, and the
 8 Commerce Clause. This case also concerns certain RHNA Laws, along with
 9 CEQA, and in addition to actions of the Defendants, violate the California
 10 Constitution under Article XI, pursuant to the City's Charter City and Municipal
 11 Corporation status, and Article IV, for Special Statute. This case challenges
 12 certain RHNA Laws, in addition to actions of the Defendants, as having violated
 13 the State's CEQA laws. Finally, it challenges actions by certain State actors, like
 14 Governor Newsom and the Director of HCD, as having committed fraud by
 15 making false statements/narratives/basis for their housing agenda. This as a
 16 result causes SCAG and cities like the City of Huntington Beach to take certain
 17 actions based on those false statements to implement high-density housing plans
 18 in certain areas of the State.

19 **State Defendants' Position:**

20 State Defendants contend that Plaintiffs lack standing to assert federal
 21 constitutional challenges against the State Defendants, and that this Court lacks
 22 jurisdiction to consider Plaintiffs' state law claims against the State Defendants.
 23 Likewise, for the reasons explained in SCAG's below statement, the issues
 24 involve questions of law that can be resolved on the pleadings.

25 **SCAG's Position:**

26 As explained above, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.

27 But, even if the Court had jurisdiction, the issues in this case boil down to
 28 questions of law that the Court can resolve on the pleadings. This is because

1 Plaintiffs challenge the RHNA Laws and thereby seek a declaration
 2 invalidating, and an order enjoining, at least sixteen separate sections of the
 3 Government Code, some of which are at least forty years old. This challenge is
 4 premised on deficient constitutional and state law claims, including asserted
 5 violations of: (i) the federal constitution, including the First Amendment,
 6 Fourteenth Amendment, and the Commerce Clause, (ii) the California
 7 Constitution, including Articles I, IV, and XI, and (iii) state law, including
 8 CEQA and the RHNA Laws. Also, and separately, Plaintiffs include a fraud
 9 claim against SCAG and the State Defendants.

10 None of Plaintiffs' allegations rise to the level of a cognizable claim and the
 11 Court should dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint without leave to
 12 amend.

13 **D. Damages:**

14 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

15 Injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees, costs, and any other relief
 16 whether monetary or declaratory/injunctive in nature that is deemed appropriate.

17 **State Defendants' Position:**

18 Plaintiffs are not entitled to any relief and have no claim for damages against
 19 the State Defendants by virtue of the Eleventh Amendment and other immunity
 20 doctrines.

21 **SCAG's Position:**

22 SCAG denies Plaintiffs' entitlement to any relief, including damages, under
 23 any of their asserted claims.

24 **E. Parties and Evidence:**

25 **Parties:**

26 Plaintiffs, the City of Huntington Beach, the City Council, the Mayor Tony
 27 Strickland, the Mayor Pro Tem Gracey Van Der Mark, and

28 ///

Defendants Governor Gavin Newsom, Director of HCD Gustavo Velasquez, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the State’s Department of Housing & Community Development.

Plaintiffs’ Percipient Witnesses:

1. Mayor of Huntington Beach, Tony Strickland
2. Mayor Pro Tem of Huntington Beach, Gracey Van Der Mark
3. Other Huntington Beach City Council Members
4. Members of the Planning Commission
5. Huntington Beach City Planner, Jennifer Villasenor
6. Huntington Beach City staff
7. Michael S. Tilden, the Acting, or then Acting, California State Auditor regarding the Auditor’s March 17, 2022 Report on Regional Housing Needs Assessments as alleged in the Complaint.
8. Person Most Knowledgeable from the California State Auditor’s Office regarding the Auditor’s March 17, 2022 Report on Regional Housing Needs Assessments as alleged in the Complaint.
9. California Governor, Gavin Newsom.
10. Person Most Knowledgeable from the California Governor’s Office regarding any statements made by the Governor or the Governor’s Office involving or relating to the “housing crisis” or the “need for housing” or any such statement to any similar effect as alleged in the Complaint.
11. Director of the State of California Department of Housing & Community Development, Gustavo Velasquez.
12. Person Most Knowledgeable from the State of California Department of Housing & Community Development regarding any statements made by HCD involving or relating to the “housing crisis” or the “need for housing” or any such statement to any similar effect as alleged in the Complaint.
13. Person Most Knowledgeable from the State of California Department of

- 1 Housing & Community Development regarding the 13,368 units of RHNA
- 2 assigned to the City of Huntington Beach as alleged in the Complaint.
- 3 14. Person Most Knowledgeable from the Southern California Association of
- 4 Governments regarding the 13,368 units of RHNA assigned to the City of
- 5 Huntington Beach as alleged in the Complaint.
- 6 15. State Legislators, to be identified, with knowledge of SB 1333 and RHNA
- 7 Laws as alleged in the Complaint.
- 8 16. The Consultants who prepared the City's 2022/2023 Environmental Impact
- 9 Report for the proposed Housing Element update presented to Council on April
- 10 4, 2023.
- 11 17. Consultants who Prepared the City's proposed Housing Element Update
- 12 18. Other witnesses who will be identified during discovery in this case.

State Defendants' Percipient Witnesses:

1 Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of law. In addition, Plaintiffs' claims are
2 fundamentally legal objections to California's housing laws. Plaintiffs' fraud claim,
3 moreover, boils down to a difference of opinion on whether California has a
4 shortage of housing. State Defendants do not plan to call any percipient witnesses in
5 this action.

SCAG's Percipient Witnesses:

1. Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of law. However, in the event the Court rules
otherwise, the following are SCAG's key percipient witnesses:
2. SCAG personnel who worked on the RHNA allocation numbers for the "6th
RHNA Cycle," spanning from 2021 through 2029.

Plaintiffs' Key Documents:

1. The City of Huntington Beach's Environmental Impact Report for the Housing
Element Amendment along with Statement of Overriding Considerations
presented to the City Council at times in 2022 and presented again on April 4,
2023.

- 1 2. The California State Auditor's March 17, 2022, Report on Regional Housing
2 Needs Assessments.
- 3 3. The voluminous documents produced by the California State Auditor in
4 response to the City's California Public Records Request (CPRA) calling for
5 records to be produced related to, or a basis of, the California State Auditor's
6 March 17, 2022 Report on Regional Housing Needs Assessments.
- 7 4. Multiple Articles reporting statements by Governor Gavin Newsom regarding
8 the "housing crisis" or the "need for housing" or any such statement to any
9 similar effect as alleged in the Complaint.
- 10 5. Multiple Articles reporting statements by HCD regarding the "housing crisis"
11 or the "need for housing" or any such statement to any similar effect as alleged
12 in the Complaint.
- 13 6. Multiple Articles reporting on the California State Auditor's March 17, 2022
14 Report on Regional Housing Needs Assessments as alleged in the Complaint.
- 15 7. Transit maps, population maps, geographical maps, water systems maps,
16 environment maps, and other maps depicting the City of Huntington Beach and
17 its features.
- 18 8. Various photographs and video depicting the City of Huntington Beach and its
19 features.
- 20 9. Various video clips of Press Conferences or other on-camera announcements
21 by the Governor or other State officials related to the City of Huntington Beach
22 or the "housing crisis" or the "need for housing" or any such statement to any
23 similar effect as alleged in the Complaint.
- 24 10. Charts/Data reflecting the City's population, development over time, and
25 housing supply.
- 26 11. Transit maps, population maps, geographical maps, water systems maps,
27 environment maps, and other maps depicting the other cities and their features.
- 28 12. Various photographs and video depicting the other cities both developed and

1 undeveloped, and their features.

2 13. Charts/Data reflecting the other cities' populations, development over time, and
3 housing supply.

4 14. Text of State Legislative and Committee notes for SB 1333, the Housing Laws,
5 and the RHNA Laws as contemplated in and/or alleged in the Complaint.

6 15. The Charter of the City of Huntington Beach.

7 16. Municipal and Zoning Code

8 17. California's Census data.

9 18. Housing Development data.

10 19. Letter communications between the City of Huntington Beach and HCD in
11 recent years.

12 20. Letter communications between the City of Huntington Beach and SCAG in
13 recent years.

14 21. Housing Element Update and all related documents, reports, and public hearing
15 information.

16 22. The 2022/2023 Environmental Impact Report, public reports, documents and
17 public hearing information

18 23. Other various documents that Plaintiffs anticipate will be discovered and
19 identified through the discovery process.

20 **State Defendants' Key Documents:**

21 1. Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of law. In any event, if the Court does not
22 dismiss Plaintiffs' lawsuit, the State Defendants may use documents related to
23 the City's housing element update, including any and all communications
24 between the City and HCD.

25 **SCAG's Key Documents:**

26 1. Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of law. However, in the event the Court rules
27 otherwise, the following are SCAG's key documents:

28 2. Documents relating to SCAG's determination and setting of the RHNA

housing unit allocations for the 6th RHNA planning cycle, including staff reports, formal adopted unit allocations, any appeals and related staff reports, as well as calculations, spreadsheets, tables, plans, methodologies, data sheets, and policies and procedures.

F. Insurance:

Plaintiff City of Huntington Beach is self-insured up to \$1,000,000 and in excess of that amount is secured by excess insurance/reinsurance for itself.

State Defendants: State Defendants are self-insured.

SCAG: Plaintiffs' action does not seek damages. In any event, SCAG is insured as follows: SCAG obtains its insurance through the California Joint Powers Insurance Authority in an amount up to \$30 Million, and is also insured in excess of that limit by way of excess coverage by California Joint Powers Insurance Authority up to \$50 Million.

G. Manual for Complex Litigation:

The parties agree that this is not a complex case and therefore does not necessitate utilizing procedures from the Manual for Complex Litigation.

H. Motions:

For Plaintiffs: Only such Evidentiary or Issues Motions as may be necessary throughout the course of the litigation and prior to trial in this matter.

For State Defendants: Given the dispositive legal bases justifying dismissal, State Defendants will pursue the earliest feasible dismissal of Plaintiffs' lawsuit, as well as the earliest feasible dismissal or denial of any and all claims in Plaintiffs' lawsuits, and will file any such motion to that effect as necessary. State Defendants may also file discovery motions as necessary.

For SCAG: SCAG does not contemplate filing any other motions at this time, except potentially another motion to dismiss should Plaintiffs be granted leave to amend following hearing on SCAG's pending Motion to Dismiss.

///

1 **I. Dispositive Motions:**

2 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

3 Defendants' respective Motions to Dismiss are scheduled for hearing on July
4 27, 2023.

5 **State Defendants' Position:**

6 State Defendants have filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended
7 Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), (6). Granting this
8 motion will result in dismissal of the entirety of Plaintiffs' action.

9 **SCAG's Position:**

10 SCAG has filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint
11 set to be heard on July 27, 2023. SCAG's Motion wholly disposes of the FAC
12 against it on the following grounds:

- 13 • The entire action must be dismissed because Plaintiffs lack standing to
14 challenge the RHNA Laws on constitutional grounds.
- 15 • Each of Plaintiffs' federal constitutional claims are also meritless:
 - 16 ○ Plaintiffs' First Amendment claim fails because no speech has been
17 burdened as a matter of law.
 - 18 ○ Plaintiffs' procedural due process claim fails because Plaintiffs cannot
19 allege a property interest and the RHNA Laws provide sufficient
20 process as a matter of law.
 - 21 ○ Plaintiffs' substantive due process claim fails because Plaintiffs cannot
22 allege a protected interest, and the RHNA Laws have a rational basis to
23 accomplish a legitimate governmental objective as a matter of law.
 - 24 ○ Plaintiffs' commerce clause claim fails because the RHNA Laws do not
25 discriminate against out-of-state commerce, nor excessively burden
26 interstate commerce as a matter of law.
- 27 • Each of Plaintiffs' state law claims are also meritless:
 - 28 ○ Plaintiffs' "home rule" claim fails because the RHNA Laws constitute

1 a matter of statewide concern as a matter of law.

- 2 ○ Plaintiffs' RHNA allocation claim fails because judicial review of the
- 3 RHNA allocations are precluded.
- 4 ○ Plaintiffs' separation of power claim fails because the RHNA Laws do
- 5 not violate the state constitution's separation of powers clause as a
- 6 matter of law.
- 7 ○ Plaintiffs' "bill of attainder" claim fails because the RHNA Laws do
- 8 not constitute a legislative punishment.
- 9 ○ Plaintiffs' CEQA claim fails because complying with CEQA is not a
- 10 CEQA violation.
- 11 ○ Plaintiffs' "special statute" claim fails because the challenged
- 12 provisions of the RHNA Laws have a rational basis to the housing
- 13 needs of the regions they relate to.
- 14 ○ Plaintiffs' fraud claim fails because Plaintiffs fail to plead fraud with
- 15 specificity and nevertheless SCAG has statutory immunity.

16 **J. Status of Discovery:**

17 Discovery has not yet commenced in this matter as the hearings on the
 18 dispositive motions filed have not yet been fully briefed or decided. However, the
 19 Parties have agreed to exchange their respective Initial Rule 26 Disclosures on June
 20 13, 2023, which is within 14 days of the Conference held among the Parties on May
 21 30, 2023.

22 **K. Discovery Plan:**

23 The parties address the subjects contained in Rule 26(f) as follows:

- 24 1) Changes to Initial Disclosure Requirements. As discussed above, the
- 25 parties agree that initial disclosures shall be made on June 13, 2023.
- 26 2) Subjects of Discovery.
- 27 Plaintiffs: Plaintiffs anticipate depositions of the parties and witnesses
- 28 concerning the facts of this case.

1 State Defendants: State Defendants do not anticipate needing to serve
 2 any discovery because this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to
 3 hear this action. If Plaintiffs claims survive, the State Defendants will
 4 pursue discovery on the surviving causes of action.

5 SCAG: SCAG does not anticipate needing to serve any discovery on
 6 the basis that it believes it will prevail on its Motion to Dismiss,
 7 including on the grounds that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction
 8 to hear this action. However, in the event any of Plaintiffs' claims
 9 survive SCAG's Motion to Dismiss, SCAG will serve written
 10 discovery with respect to Plaintiffs' surviving causes of action.

11 3) Changes to the Limitations of Discovery.

12 Plaintiffs: Plaintiffs do not anticipate the need to change the limitations
 13 of discovery as prescribed by FRCP or this Court's Local Rules.

14 State Defendants: State Defendants join SCAG's below request for a
 15 stay.

16 SCAG: SCAG requests that any further discovery beyond the initial
 17 disclosures be stayed until 10 days after the Court's ruling on the
 18 pending Motion to Dismiss, on the grounds that the Court lacks subject
 19 matter to hear this action.

20 4) Any Other Court Orders:

21 Plaintiffs: Plaintiffs do not propose that the Court issue any other
 22 orders under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b), 16(c), or 26(c).

23 State Defendants: State Defendants join SCAG's below request for a
 24 stay.

25 SCAG: As discussed above, SCAG requests that the Court issues a
 26 Rule 16(b) scheduling order that stays discovery until 10 days after the
 27 Court's ruling on the pending Motion to Dismiss.

28 ///

1 Plaintiffs anticipate serving written interrogatories, requests for admission,
 2 and requests for production of documents on the issues of constitutional violation
 3 issues, methodology and purpose behind State Housing Laws and allocation, and
 4 violation of CEQA to comply with State Housing Laws, particularly RHNA Laws.

5 The parties do not see any issues regarding electronically stored information
 6 pursuant to Rule 26(f)(3)(C) in this case.

7 **L. Discovery Cut-Off:**

8 Plaintiffs propose a fact discovery-cut off of February 22, 2024.

9 Defendants propose a fact discovery-cut off of February 22, 2024.

10 **M. Expert Discovery:**

11 Plaintiffs propose an initial expert witness disclosure exchange date of March
 12 7, 2024, a rebuttal expert witness disclosure date of March 21, 2024, and an expert
 13 discovery cut-off of April 4, 2024.

14 State Defendants and SCAG jointly propose an initial expert witness
 15 disclosure exchange date of March 7, 2024, a rebuttal expert witness disclosure date
 16 of March 21, 2024, and an expert discovery cut-off of April 4, 2024.

17 **N. Settlement Conference and Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR”):**

18 Plaintiffs: The parties have not discussed settlement and Plaintiffs wish to
 19 conduct further discovery before addressing the possibility of settlement. Plaintiffs
 20 elect to proceed with ADR Procedure No. # 2 – District Court Panel Mediator.

21 State Defendants: State Defendants do not believe this case is amenable to
 22 settlement.

23 SCAG: SCAG does not believe this case is amenable to settlement.

24 **O. Preliminary Trial Estimate:**

25 All parties have requested a jury trial. Plaintiffs estimate that trial will take
 26 approximately 10 court days and expects to call approximately 20 witnesses at trial.

27 The State Defendants estimate that should trial be necessary, it should take 1
 28 to 3 days, and they expect to call 1 expert witness at trial on the narrow issue of the

1 existence of a crisis-level housing shortage.

2 SCAG estimates that should trial be necessary, it will take approximately 3 to
3 5 court days and expects to call approximately 5 witnesses at trial.

4 **P. Trial Counsel:**

5 Plaintiffs: Michael E. Gates (lead), Nadin S. Said.

6 State Defendants: Deputy Attorneys General Matthew T. Struhar (lead) and
7 Thomas Kinzinger

8 SCAG: Deborah J Fox (lead), David Mehretu, and Kristof D. Szoke.

9 **Q. Magistrate Judge:**

10 At this time, the parties do not agree to consent to have the Magistrate Judge
11 preside over the proceedings of this matter, including trial.

12 **R. Independent Expert or Master:**

13 The parties agree that this is not a case in which a master pursuant to Federal
14 Rule of Civil Procedure 53 or an independent scientific expert should be appointed.

15 **S. Response to June 8, 2023 Minute Order**

16 In response to this Court's Minute Order Dated June 8, 2023 regarding failing
17 to attach the Schedule of Pretrial and Trial Dates Worksheet, this was a clerical error
18 on behalf of Plaintiffs' counsel's office. The parties had previously met and
19 conferred over and completed the Worksheet as required, however it was

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 inadvertently left off when filing. The parties hereby certify that they have reviewed
2 the Local Civil Rules of the Central District of California, Judge Slaughter's
3 Procedures web page, accessible at: [https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-fred-](https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-fred-w-slaughter)
4 [w-slaughter](https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-fred-w-slaughter), the Court's Initial Standing Order and the Court's Order Setting
5 Scheduling Conference.

6
7 Dated: June 9, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
MICHAEL E. GATES, CITY ATTORNEY

8
9
10 By: /s/ Michael E. Gates
MICHAEL E. GATES, CITY ATTORNEY
11 Attorney for Plaintiffs,
12 CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, and
13 HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY COUNCIL, and
14 MAYOR TONY STRICKLAND, and
15 MAYOR PRO TEM GRACEY VAN DER
MARK

16
17 Dated: June 9, 2023

ROB BONTA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
CALIFORNIA

18
19 By: /s/ Thomas P. Kinzinger
Thomas P. Kinzinger, Deputy Attorney General
20 Attorney for Defendants, GAVIN NEWSOM, IN
21 HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR
22 OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND
23 INDIVIDUALLY; GUSTAVO VELASQUEZ,
24 IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS DIRECTOR
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
25 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND
26 INDIVIDUALLY; AND THE CALIFORNIA
27 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
28 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1 Dated: June 9, 2023

MEYERS NAVE

2
3 By: /s/ Deborah J. Fox

4 DEBORAH J. FOX

5 DAVID MEHRETU

6 KRISTOF D. SZOKE

7 Attorneys for Defendant

8 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION

9 OF GOVERNMENTS

JUDGE FRED W. SLAUGHTER
SCHEDULE OF PRETRIAL AND TRIAL DATES WORKSHEET

Please complete this worksheet jointly and file it with your Joint Rule 26(f) Report.
The parties must make every effort to agree on dates or the court will set them.

Case No. 8:23-cv-00421-FWS-ADS		Case Name: City of Huntington Beach, et al. v. Gavin Newsom, et al.		
Trial and Final Pretrial Conference Dates		Pl(s)' Date mm/dd/yyyy	Def(s)' Date mm/dd/yyyy	Court Order mm/dd/yyyy
Check one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jury Trial or <input type="checkbox"/> Bench Trial [Tuesday at 8:30 a.m., within 18 months after Complaint filed] Estimated Duration: _____ Days		9/10/2024	9/10/2024	<input type="checkbox"/> Jury Trial <input type="checkbox"/> Bench Trial _____ Days
Final Pretrial Conference ("FPTC") [L.R. 16], Hearing on Motions <i>in Limine</i> [Thursday at 8:30 a.m., at least 12 days before trial]		8/22/2024	8/22/2024	
Event¹ <i>Note:</i> Hearings shall be on Thursdays at 10:00 a.m. Other dates can be any day of the week.		Weeks Before FPTC	Pl(s)' Date mm/dd/yyyy	Def(s)' Date mm/dd/yyyy
Last Date to Hear Motion to Amend Pleadings /Add Parties [Thursday]			9/28/2023	9/28/2023
Non-Expert Discovery Cut-Off (no later than deadline for filing dispositive motions)		26	2/22/2024	2/22/2024
Expert Disclosure (Initial)		24	3/7/2024	3/7/2024
Expert Disclosure (Rebuttal)		22	3/21/2024	3/21/2024
Expert Discovery Cut-Off		20 ²	4/4/2024	4/4/2024
Last Date to Hear Motions [Thursday] • Motion for Summary Judgment due at least 6 weeks before hearing • All other motions due at least 4 weeks before hearing • Opposition due 2 weeks after Motion is filed • Reply due 1 week after Opposition is filed		12	5/30/2024	5/30/2024
Deadline to Complete Settlement Conference [L.R. 16-15] <i>Select one:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Magistrate Judge (with Court approval) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Court's Mediation Panel <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Private Mediation		10	6/13/2024	6/13/2024
Trial Filings (first round) • Motions <i>in Limine</i> with Proposed Orders • Memoranda of Contentions of Fact and Law [L.R. 16-4] • Witness Lists [L.R. 16-5] • Joint Exhibit List [L.R. 16-6.1] • Joint Status Report Regarding Settlement • Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law [L.R. 52] (bench trial only) • Declarations containing Direct Testimony, if ordered (bench trial only)		3	8/1/2024	8/1/2024
Trial Filings (second round) • Oppositions to Motions <i>in Limine</i> • Joint Proposed Final Pretrial Conference Order [L.R. 16-7] • Joint/Agreed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only) • Disputed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only) • Joint Proposed Verdict Forms (jury trial only) • Joint Proposed Statement of the Case (jury trial only) • Proposed Additional Voir Dire Questions, if any (jury trial only) • Evidentiary Objections to Declarations of Direct Testimony (bench trial only)		2	8/8/2024	8/8/2024

¹ The parties may seek dates for additional events by filing a separate Stipulation and Proposed Order. Class actions, patent, and ERISA cases may need to vary from the above.

² The parties may wish to consider cutting off expert discovery prior to the deadline for filing a motion for summary judgment.